


No. 59

December 1972

Spearhead

10p



BURTON

OUR 'MORAL OBLIGATION'

WHERE DOES IT LIE?

(PAGE 3)

Nationalist comment

WHAT WE THINK

on the month's news

Freeze Futility

Immediately the Government price freeze was announced, it was easy to see that it will not work, and for these reasons:—

The vulnerability of the British economy to international markets places us at the mercy of foreign suppliers, not only of raw materials but of many manufactured products. Not only are a vast amount of the finished products of industry sold in Britain made abroad, but so also do many 'British-made' products rely on a great number of components supplied from abroad. It is impossible to apply price freezes on such products; we have to pay what foreigners decide to charge for them. In almost every sector of the British economy, these foreign imports are an element in the make-up of prices of goods and services in this country. While every importing country has the same problem, a country which is reliant on imports for a greater part of its economic

existence than any other major industrial country in the world is affected far more than the others.

This problem will recede only when Britain is insulated as far as her resources will allow from the world economy.

Another reason why the freeze will fail is that it does not take into account one of the biggest factors in inflation: the slavery of interest.

Enoch Powell has rightly said that the biggest cause of inflation is the pumping of money into the economy in excess of goods. He has not, however, told the whole story. Who pumps the money into the economy in this way? The answer is, not the Government, but private financial and banking interests. And under what conditions do they do so? The answer is the conditions of loans that have to be repaid at interest.

With most of the new money coming into the economy every year being interest-bearing debt, it means that an increasing proportion of the expenditure of industry goes in the payment of that interest to the banks. This of course represents another element in the price of many articles for sale. The Government has done nothing to curb this indebtedness.

And of course it will not. Nothing short of a complete economic revolution would be involved in such a challenge to the sacred rights of the bankers.

And we will not see such a revolution coming from a party which is in the pockets of the bankers and many of whose leaders are hand in glove with banking interests.

There is one final consideration. The public is unlikely to be impressed by the sincerity of 'price freeze' policies applied by this Government when the fact is that the same Government has deliberately raised food prices so as to bring them up towards

Common Market levels in order to ease Britain's passage into the Market.

Pure Waffle

When we heard that the Government had published its summary of the position in Northern Ireland following its multi-lateral conference in Darlington, we knew more or less what to expect and, reading it, we find nothing in the way of surprises.

The document, called *The Future of Northern Ireland*, is too lengthy to analyse in depth in this column. Suffice it to say that it consists of just under a hundred pages of pure, unadulterated waffle which leave us at the end exactly where we were at the beginning, drifting along on clouds of vagueness, sweet platitudes, moral sermons, repeated hypotheses and total lack of any sign of firm decision or even intention.

If any intention is claimed at all, it is in the very first paragraph in which the document says:

"The British Government have a clear objective in Northern Ireland. It is to deliver its people from the violence and fear in which they live today . . ."

While no-one in his right mind can quarrel with this objective, its place in the order of things is perhaps revealing. One might have hoped that the first objective stated would be that of ensuring that Northern Ireland remained a territory of the British Crown. But nowhere in the whole paper is there the sign that there is any determination to such an end. There is only a repetition of the insipid promise that Northern Ireland will remain British for as long as the majority wishes (into which promise anyone may read the message that as soon as the majority changes its mind the Government will be quite happy to chuck Northern Ireland away!)

Throughout the paper the Government's anxiousness to be 'non-partisan' results in a quite ludicrous balancing act in which the point of view of every cranky little minority is presented and examined with the utmost respect. In fact the very preparedness of any Government not to be partisan over a matter involving the sovereignty of a part of its own territory and people is a sure symptom of decadence and abdication of will.

Perhaps the most degrading chapter is that entitled 'The Irish Dimension'. In this chapter the Government clearly acknowledges the right of the Irish Republic to be involved, and thus consulted, in the matter of Ulster's future: "It is . . . clearly desirable that any new arrangements for Northern Ireland should, whilst meeting the wishes of Northern Ireland and Great Britain, be so far as possible acceptable to and accepted by the Republic of Ireland which from 1st January 1973 will share the rights and obligations of membership of the European Communities."

Why "acceptable" to the Republic of Ireland? And, more to the point, what

S P E A R H E A D

No. 59 DECEMBER 1972

Office: 50 Pawsons Road, Croydon, CRO 2QF, Surrey (Tel. 01-684 3730)

Editor: John Tyndall Asst. Editor: Martin Webster

Spearhead exists to reflect a cross-section of contemporary British nationalist opinion. It is privately published by its Editor and is independent of all political parties and groups.

Unless specifically stated to the contrary, the views expressed in signed articles or letters are the sole responsibility of their authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the Editor or the policies of any political organisation *Spearhead* may support editorially.

The appearance of an advertisement in *Spearhead* is not necessarily indicative that the Editor has any knowledge of, interest in or support for the product, service, organisation or function advertised.

Spearhead welcomes enquiries from potential advertisers, to whom rates will be sent on request. Advertising matter, accompanied by pre-payment, must be submitted at least one month prior to the publishing date (normally the first day of each month) of the issue for which the advertisement is intended. The Editor reserves the right to refuse to publish advertisements submitted.

The Editor is pleased to receive from readers manuscripts of articles for possible publication which should normally be not longer than 1,250 words and typed in double-spacing. No payment is made for articles published, which become *Spearhead* copyright unless authors specifically request otherwise at the time they submit their manuscripts. The Editor reserves the right to shorten or otherwise amend articles accepted for publication should shortage of space or editorial judgment require such alteration to be made.

Those wishing to re-print *Spearhead* articles must first gain the permission of the Editor and undertake to include with the re-printed matter the author's name and the name and address of *Spearhead*.

“rights” of membership of the European Communities? Great God! What kind of a country does the Government want the world to take us for? What happens on British territory is solely the concern of the British themselves and involves solely the rights of the British themselves. Does the Government now contest this?

What is remarkable about the whole document is that **nowhere** in any of its pages does it make mention of a criminal and internationally directed conspiracy, involving communists among other subversive elements, to foment armed revolution in a part of the British realm. It merely utters a few pious phrases about repudiating the men of violence, and leaves it at that. As for destroying the apparatus that has caused the violence — not a suggestion!

Brats' Charter

“Violence and vandalism, unchecked and unpunished, is to be demanded as a right for Britain’s 500,000 students.

“According to the demand — to be put to the National Union of Students — they would be justified in smashing anything or anyone they disagreed with.

“Particular targets would be college authorities who try to restrict students, ‘racists and Fascists’ and dons who do research work for the Ministry of Defence.

“The attacks would be backed by a ‘demo-bible’ — giving detailed instructions for protests — published by the NUS and distributed to every student body in the country.”

An excerpt from the columns of *Daily Telegraph* satirist Peter Simple? No. Believe it or not, true fact. This plan has been put together by ruling militants at York, Aston, Reading and Bath universities, representing 12,500 students. Aston University’s proposals declare that “the distinction between violence to property and to persons is largely academic and that in any case ‘democratic’ decisions taken by students are likely to be impeded by violence.

“Therefore,” the proposals say, “we reserve the right of students to defend themselves and their decisions at all times.”

Will the authors of this plan be appropriately dealt with by being chucked out of their university places, leaving those places open for young people who seriously want to study and learn? Not a hope!

China Capers

Disraeli once said in his novel *Coningsby* that the world is governed by very different persons than imagined by those who are not behind the scenes.

One was reminded of this quote when trying to deduce the usefulness to Britain of Foreign Secretary Sir Alec Douglas Home’s visit to China recently. Sir Alec was recorded as having said after his talks with Chou En Lai that Britain and China “had much in



HARLEQUIN HOME
The Foreign Secretary pictured on a camel during another visit to exotic climes.

common.” This will be news to such people as George Watt and Anthony Gray, who rotted in Chinese prisons for some time without any offences being proved against them; it will also be news to the world’s police agencies, who are stretched to the limit coping with the international drug traffic which China has promoted; also perhaps to those who have felt the effect of China’s massive subversion of British and other European interests in Africa.

Sir Alec also commented on the trade position between Britain and China by saying that he and Chou had agreed that it was “too low at present.” Why? one wonders. Because there is anything that China produces of which Britain has need? Or simply because international trade for its own sake is axiomatically good and moral — even if it is with subverters and gangsters?

But perhaps the most fascinating statement by the Foreign Secretary was that “the ice in our relationship has been broken. Now the water is warm and we can swim in it together.”

Well, well. What fun we are going to have speculating over the meaning of that little message! What exciting prospects for us does it herald?

It is indeed difficult to imagine that pathetic harlequins like Home and Nixon prance around the globe wining and dining

with the Communist elite for the official purposes of foreign policy reported in the newspapers and over the broadcasting media, and that the speeches accompanying their trips have any meaning at all in the real world of international dealings. While China has been regularly engaged in every conceivable anti-Western activity, including of course the promotion of the war in Vietnam, such diplomatic posturings simply do not make sense by any normal reckonings.

They could only make sense in the context of some hidden nexus, binding together two worlds which to all outward appearances are in life-or-death conflict, some element in international affairs which, when identified, reveals an entirely different picture from the one on which we are fed daily at our breakfast tables.

Not Sir Alec or President Nixon, but perhaps the latter’s adviser, contact man and ‘Mr. Fixit’, Henry Kissinger — a frequent visitor in Peking — could enlighten us on this matter, if he were so disposed.

Poor Dears!

Ugandan Asians at one transit camp waiting for settlement in Britain do not like the way their curry is being served and have threatened a hunger strike if there is not an improvement.

What a shame! But let us not despair. Such a demand should not be beyond the means of Britain’s vast humanitarian, do-gooder industry. Why not a ‘meals-on-wheels’ service shuttled to the transit camp from London’s Veeraswamy’s Restaurant — and, just to ensure no hunger strikes, the curry dishes delivered up to our new citizens by the Archbishop of Canterbury, Mark Bonham Carter, Jeremy Thorpe, Sir Charles Cunningham and Lord Brockway — all on bended knee — while Barbara Castle, Shirley Williams and Joan Lester attend the proceedings as Ladies in Waiting.

One gets the feeling that those august personages would derive great joy and honour from such functions.

The Real Obligations

It looks like the Government has now abandoned the pretence that Britain has a legal obligation to let in Uganda’s Asians and is talking only of a ‘moral obligation’.

This sudden sense of moral obligations is very touching. It comes after years and years during which no comparable moral obligations towards our own old folk have been acknowledged in practice. Hundreds of thousands, probably millions, of these folk still live in stinking slums with no adequate light, heat or water. If all the work and expense now being generated can be expended in the cause of giving the Asians places to live, why could it not be expended in improving the conditions of our own old people?

S.C.M.: THE COMMUNIST CHRISTIANS



I FIRST came across the Student Christian Movement when the religious department of my old school became deluged with its propaganda. Little of it was concerned with religion, but there was a lot about politics in general and Marxist philosophy in particular.

Its *Probe* series of publications contain such currently trendy titles as *Human Rights* and *Racial Discrimination*. Among the latter's list of books "recommended for further study by schools" is one written by Paul Foot, two published by Gollancz, one by the Fabian Society and one by Lawrence and Wishart. One SCM publication intended for primary school kids contains, amongst other things, a model assembly idealising Che Guevara.

The SCM's headquarters were appropriately housed at 56 Bloomsbury Street, Hampstead, but are now to be found at 'Annandale', North End Road, London NW11 7QX. Though the SCM was set up eighty years ago to promote evangelism in universities and is officially registered as a charity, its present activities are overwhelmingly political and centre around three main subjects, which are:—

SUBVERSION IN SOUTHERN AFRICA

The 'Europe/Africa Research Project' was set up in 1969 "to forge supportive links with the struggling peoples of Africa and the rest of the Third World" (SCM introductory pamphlet). It has a full-time director in the person of Chenhamo Chimutengwende. Two other members of this Project are nominated as SCM representatives to the International Department of the British Council of Churches and to the Anti-Apartheid Movement. In 1970 the SCM published a report supporting the use of violence in South Africa.

USE OF IMMIGRANTS IN U.K.

In the field of 'race relations' the SCM also publishes a booklet by a certain Robert Moore. One passage particularly typifies the ethno-masochism of white 'liberal' degenerates: "... black men have to assert their

power wherever they find themselves . . . Many coloured people will be persuaded by white expressions of good will to pursue peace at any price . . . This is a coloured man's problem. No white man may complain about the vehemence or stridency with which the black man mounts his protest for this will be a response to the injustices to which he, the white man, is a party." Shades of 'we are all guilty', etc.

The article goes on to illustrate the way in which Black Power is and will be increasingly used as an integral part of an interconnected revolutionary conspiracy: "Fruitful links might be made between the Free University for Black Studies, Poverty Action Groups, tenants' associations, church groups and the underground church and various youth/student/political activist groups."

EDUCATIONAL DISRUPTION

The SCM has also dipped its cancerous fingers into the cesspool of educational disruption. *Educational Mailing* is sent out to subscribers four times a year. This includes such things as suggested programmes for local one-day conferences or group meetings. Amongst recommended publications to be considered in conjunction with these is *Teaching as a Subversive Activity* which is published by Penguin Education. The SCM has also prepared, or is preparing, literature on "alternatives to schooling" (SCM introductory pamphlet).

THE RED CLERICS

The SCM has been connected with a number of 'leftist' celebrities. At a conference on 'race and poverty' in April 1969, the Archbishop of Olinda and Recife, Brazil, the Most Rev. Helder Camara won a three minute ovation for his address from the 1,500 students. He "has been labelled a communist in his own country" (*The Times*, 11.4.69).

After Bishop Ambrose Reeves was deported from Johannesburg over a decade ago, he became general secretary of the Movement for a while. This infamous hypocrite has earlier been exposed by

Spearhead.

In 1966 a Methodist minister, the Rev. David Head, became its general secretary. Mr. Head resigned in April 1972 because an extraordinary general assembly of the movement refused to back his scheme to set up "a community house of international critical education" (*Guardian* 2.8.72) which would have acted as a base for the Free University for Black Studies. Before leaving he was responsible for paying nearly two thousand pounds to the Agitprop bookshop in order to enable it to move into larger premises. This payment was, of course, improper for an officially registered charity to make.

The post of general secretary has now been accepted by Dr. Basil Moore, a Methodist theologian, "who recently left South Africa . . . after receiving a five-year banning order for his work with the University Christian Movement which was accused of 'furthering the aims of Communism'." (SCM *Communiques* Oct/Nov. 1972)

CHRISTIAN?

The SCM does make some concession to spiritual matters: "But we have found that we cannot live by Marx alone . . ." (*ibid.*) The SCM thus quite openly condemns itself as a tool of Communist subversion. Responsible parents and teachers should see that its hard-core Marxist propaganda is not poisoning the minds of youngsters under the guise of religious study.

SPEARHEAD FUND

We take this opportunity to repeat our message of last month in which we said that *Spearhead's* estimated needs in terms of running costs during the year 1973 will require that we raise a sum over and above normal sales income of £350.

We are appealing to our readers to help us raise this sum by voluntary contributions and to begin with we are asking if any will undertake to pledge a sum of money to be sent to us over the year of between £10 and £50.

If contributors can send in their cheques immediately, so much the better. But we will equally welcome promises to pay later in the year, either in one lump sum or in instalments.

Cheques should be made out to *Spearhead* and sent to our usual address.

PRINTING SERVICES

Printing services are available to Nationalists at very reasonable rates. For estimates write to Box 1933, *Spearhead*, 50 Pawsons Road, Croydon CRO. 2QF, Surrey.

JOHN TYNDALL

FOREIGN POLICY RECONSIDERED

WE ARE FEATURING in *Spearhead* this month the report of a speech by an American Congressman on the way in which U.S. and other Western aid has nurtured Soviet industry and technology to its present position of power. All thinking British people should read and re-read this speech, for its implications for us are enormous. They ought to change the whole complexion of our international relations.

British foreign policy ever since the end of World War II has been based on one predominating theme, which can be briefly described as follows:—

In terms of conflicting interests, and therefore of conceivable major war, the world is now divided into two main blocs: the Communist bloc, in which the dominant power is the Soviet Union, and the Western bloc, in which the dominant power is the United States. Such is the power of the Soviet Union and its allies that the Western European nations would be unable to resist an armed attack by them except by being closely integrated politically, economically and militarily and living under the protective shield of America.

The sequel to this theme is that in the post-war period our international policies have been dictated, not by British interests, but by a new conception — Western interests; our security has been seen in the context, not of British defence, but of Western defence. The interests and security of Britain and the Western bloc have been assumed as one and the same and therefore no independent national policy operating outside the broader framework of 'The West' has been thought either necessary or desirable.

Or, it might be added, possible. For, accepting *prima facie* estimates of Soviet power, no deterrent to the forcible use of that power could be offered by any Western nation or combination of Western nations acting apart from America.

However, one reference to the facts given of U.S. aid to the Soviets — facts which confirm what has repeatedly been said in this journal for years — and the whole foundations of this policy are blown sky-high! In the first place, as the Congressman makes clear, the Soviet Union simply would not be in the forefront of industrial and technological powers today without American and other Western aid. Therefore how long could the Soviets remain such a power in these fields if there were not such aid? Just how great a power is the Soviet Union in terms of industry and technology generated from her

own resources? Any greater in relation to her rivals than Imperial Russia? Great enough to be able to crush an alliance of the British Commonwealth, Germany and France, or even two of those three, or even one?

And as present policies obviously imply a situation in which Soviet industry and technology would have to be self-generated, or at least generated without Western help, surely their assumption that Western integration is all that can stop Russia is pure nonsense!

But that is not all.

The facts related blow another theory sky-high at the same time, the theory that marks the starting point of our post-war

who seek to impose a monolithic one-world state.

And we believe that the bogus division of East and West is being maintained by the latter to act as their own catalyst.


After all, what is a more powerful stimulus to people to sink their own independent existence in a common pool than the feeling of a common threat to their survival — a threat too big for any of them to face singly? Across the ages it is this stimulus that has induced states to discard their divisions and their boundaries and combine as one.

And this very stimulus operates in both 'Eastern' and 'Western' camps today by way of the propaganda that tells the people in each that the other threatens them.

If the people who run America and the people who run Russia are sufficiently hand-in-glove with each other for one to nurture the other's industry and technology, could they not have other aims that they pursue together?

Such as a monolithic one-world state?

If you do not think that the facts support such a sweeping claim, surely you will agree that they support far less the



ARMED MIGHT OF COMMUNIST RUSSIA

A real enough threat — but it's being used to bulldoze Britain into surrendering her national independence.

strategy — that the only conceivable major confrontation in the future is an East/West one, a Soviet/American one. If this were so, what are the powers that be in America doing building up Soviet industry and technology?

The only explanation of this that could make sense is that our popular view of the East/West line-up does not represent the real and true division of the world, that it represents only an appearance of a division that serves to mislead.

What then is the real and true division of the world, and why is the appearance of a division between the ruling powers in America and those in Russia being maintained?

We believe very firmly that the real division of the world is between those who wish to preserve free nation states and those

concept of world divisions on which post-war strategy in Britain has been based. Indeed they reduce to absurdity the theories of the Soviet juggernaut and Western integration.

In fact they underline what all of history should tell us: that the only sure prescription for a nation's security is its own self-reliance and strength combined with an intelligent foreign policy that is able to tell real friends from real enemies and recognise that both of these are largely transient.

They make perfectly clear the guidelines for British policy in the future: a powerful and independent Britain in a powerful and independent British Commonwealth — allied (but not integrated) with those nations of the moment who wish to preserve their own freedom.

T.A.R.: A MARXIST FRONT

A REPORT BY ANDREW CONIAM

ON the 4th of November this year T.A.R. (Teachers Against Racism) held a conference at the Africa Centre in King Street to discuss the introduction of Black Studies in schools. No doubt it was the same as other T.A.R. conferences except that this time the NF sent along three teachers to observe, including myself.

I expected it to consist of the usual bunch of woolly minded liberals airing their ill considered views, but I was profoundly mistaken. The whole set-up was planned and organised by fanatical Marxists.

The morning session was dominated by two distinctly foreign looking white gentlemen: Morris Pollack, head of Social Studies at William Penn School, and Russell Hertzog, who goes under the curious title of "Curriculum Officer" for Manchester. Both of them were exceptionally smooth operators and obviously long experienced in leading and manipulating discussion groups. They never made stupid errors of fact, like the coloured speakers, but held sway by building their arguments on all sorts of unstated assumptions about race which all intelligent and enlightened people must "naturally" take for granted!

Held sway that is, until an NF supporter stood up at question time and challenged these unstated premises by giving hard scientific facts and reliable news reports. This threw the whole meeting into an uproar because these facts could not be refuted by reasoned argument. In my experience, whenever Marxists have met any reasoned opposition which cannot be refuted, they have always attempted to silence that opposition by force, and this was no exception. Immediately there were cries of "throw them out" regardless of the fact that we had paid the entrance fee and we had it in writing that the meeting was open to the public. Some of them, including a white college lecturer, became quite hysterical. It took about half an hour of hullabaloo and voting on several different motions as to what should be done with us, before the matter was settled. It turned out that there were sufficient liberals in the hall to vote that we should be allowed to stay, much to the vociferous anger of the Marxists. We were however, ignored for the rest of the conference.

The West Indian chairman of the conference with his "live for the moment" approach, had not planned the order of proceedings and this led to continual argument and confusion throughout the day. In all fairness however, it must be said that this chairman was by far the most tolerant and courteous of those present and put his white Marxist friends to shame by comparison.

NEGRO ABUSE AND OBSCENITIES

The afternoon session was taken up mainly by Negro speakers screaming abuse and obscenities about white people and calling for violent revolution against capitalist imperialist exploiters. The first was introduced as one who would talk about "African history" as a basis for teaching black studies to our children in schools. I was especially looking forward to learning something about African history, since Professor Trevor-Roper, the celebrated Oxford historian (and very much a liberal and non-racist) had said: "Perhaps in the future there will be some African history to teach, but at present there is none, or very little; there is only the history of the Europeans in Africa. The rest is largely darkness and darkness is not a subject

for history." What Trevor-Roper and all the great historians mean by this is that Black Africa had never developed a written language for itself and therefore left no written records. By the historian's definition, historical time is that from which written records can be gleaned, anything else is "prehistoric". The development of a written language is the prime requisite for any civilisation, whatever else one may attribute to that concept, so we can see that pre-colonial black Africa has probably never had a civilisation in any sense of the word. Trevor-Roper went on to say that of course societies had existed in pre-colonial black Africa which are of interest to the anthropologist, but history is the study of purposive development and broad trends, not the endless "gyrations of barbarous tribes", however picturesque. I was looking forward therefore to see whether this speaker had made some brilliant new discovery of Ancient African literature which would give Africa some history and create a subject worthy of a special course in our schools.

CRADLE OF CIVILISATION!

I was however, disappointed. The speaker started by saying "I take it for granted you all know that Africa was the cradle of civilisation, that *homo sapiens* first emerged there, that great empires and civilisations flourished across the continent in days past - that Ancient Egypt was a Negro nation, so I won't waste your time by going into those." The rest of the speech was a long confused and incoherent diatribe against white exploitation. Sadly, the mostly white audience appeared to swallow all these childish historical fantasies, so conditioned were they. There was however a note of protest against his attack on the whites by one or two of the uninitiated liberal members. If any of the present readers suffer from similar illusions, please note the following: Our modern species of *homo sapiens* - as opposed to the first "humans" - did not originate in Africa but in Europe and is associated with the Aurignacian Culture of the Upper Palaeolithic period. You can check this with any palaeontologist. If the Egyptians were Negroes, why did they always depict themselves with light brown skin and straightish hair and their slaves from Nubia with black skin and woolly hair? The truth is that it was only after a huge number of Negro immigrant workers had been imported that the Egyptian civilisation declined. The tomb paintings and the hieroglyphs speak for themselves. Finally, if black Africans had empires, i.e. the temporary hegemony of one savage tribe over several others, and this is supposed to be a fine achievement, why is white imperialism supposed to be so evil?

All in all, this poor speaker must have contradicted himself a dozen times and made numerous factual and logical errors. One finds over and over again this child-like fantacising in the African mind.

OLD CLICHES

The afternoon dragged on with one person after another, black and "white", standing up and exhorting everyone to make greater efforts to overthrow the system. The old cliches from *Das Capital* were churned out and the old chestnut

about white superiority being totally discredited by the brilliant "school" of Marxist writers, was brought out of mothballs once more. One Negro even went so far as to say that West Indian children born in Britain achieve much higher school standards than white children. He omitted however to reveal his sources for this extraordinary information.

This then was T.A.R. Few of the organisers were actually teachers, and "racialism" certainly took second place to spreading the gospel according to St. Marx. The gathering consisted of naive liberals, duped immigrants and Marxist organisers. They are heavily financed by the Rowntree Trust, the Foyle Trust, the British and World Councils of Churches and heaven knows whom else. They endanger freedom of speech and freedom of the press, since anything mildly patriotic in children's books they aim to suppress on grounds of racism. There is a good chance of them succeeding too, for they are planning to open a branch in every town and dupe idealistic young teachers into "burning the books" on humanitarian grounds.

CONNECTIONS WITH THE B.B.C.

Like so many other 'subversive' Marxist groups, they are very closely connected to the BBC. It is the T.A.R. organisers who write the scripts for the Radio London series *Black Studies*. Will those persons who mocked us when we disclosed the Marxist domination of the BBC now make their apologies?

They are also engaged in active support of violence - encouraging black-power groups such as the Black Panthers. Lenin was not kidding when he said that the revolution in Britain would have to be imported.

All in all, T.A.R. is a thoroughly perverse influence and an insidious cancer in the educational system of this country. It aims to corrupt both our teachers and our youth with its conferences, broadsheets, teaching programmes and literary suppression. If you find this incredible, read one of its broadsheets or go along to one of its meetings and see.

Whether you are a National Front supporter or a multi-racialist show this report to every teacher and clergyman that you know and urge them to have nothing to do with this organisation. It is simply a Marxist front dedicated to the destruction of society.

A SUB FOR XMAS

While you are thinking of what to give your friends at Christmas, why not send them a gift subscription to *Spearhead*!

We have attractively printed Christmas cards which we will send to the recipient on your behalf wishing them the compliments of the season and saying that you have treated them to a sub.

You may send your friend a year's sub. for £1.50 or six months' sub. for 75p. We will give a discount for a block order for three subs. of 20 per-cent. Just send in the money to us with the name(s) and address(es) of those to whom you wish the cards and copies to be sent.

FUTILE STRUGGLE

In the November 1972 edition of *Struggle*, the publication of the Maoist Communist Federation of Britain (Marxist-Leninist), a contributor writes:—

"The National Front blames the immigrant population of this country for rising unemployment, etc. in Britain, and completely omits to mention that it was successive capitalist governments that encouraged immigration to this country when Britain needed cheap labour, and that it was successive British governments that milked the colonies dry."

As the OCTOBER issue of *Spearhead* carried my article 'The New Colonialism', which quite clearly stated that the underlying cause of both immigration and the robbery of the Third World is International Capitalism, I am pleased to quote the above, as being glaringly indicative of the ignorance, dim-wittedness and downright dishonesty of the extreme Left.

Also, when was it that "BRITAIN needed cheap labour"? As a 'scientific' Marxist-Leninist, *Struggle's* writer should have been able to comprehend that it is CAPITALISM that needs cheap labour — not the British people. Nought out of ten to the Maoists for an unprincipled slip into 'revisionism' and 'class-treachery'!

REMEMBER THE DENIGRATORS

The Tory *Daily Express* excelled itself in a particularly snide comment following Remembrance Sunday. It attacked "those who organise marches in an attempt to denigrate the day for political motives." You can be sure that, by this remark, they did not mean the official wreath-layers who used the occasion to place our British war dead on a moral par with their enemies. The *Express* was bitching about the National Front.

It certainly is 'political' to point out that today's Establishment pro-Europeans are selling out that British Freedom for which the flower of our British manhood perished in two World Wars . . . It is 'political' to re-state the fact that World War I was caused by Imperialistic dynastic rivalries of Europe's economic and political ruling class . . . It is 'political' to remind people that the punitive "peace" that came after the First World War led directly to the bitter resentments that exploded in the second . . . It is 'political' to recall the fact that political impotence and inadequacy opened the road to the Great Crash, economic ruin and the rise of authoritarianism and expansionism ending in World War II . . . It is 'political' to reiterate that the Tory/Labour 'policy' of weakness and surrender to violence in Northern Ireland has been a major cause of

MICHAEL LOBB

CONTRARY VIEWPOINT

both British civilian and military deaths and injury in that province . . . It is 'political' to state that British servicemen fought to keep this country free of alien invasion — yet Tory/Labour/Liberal politicians have let into Britain millions of Coloured Immigrant invaders . . . It is 'political' to state that the Westminster Government refused to lay a wreath for Rhodesia's war dead because of a dispute between London and Salisbury that was "political" and nothing else . . .

The *Daily Express* knows that it is impossible to remove the political content from Remembrance Day. It is Establishment politics which have played a large part in causing the deaths of those we remember on that day. It is Establishment politicians of Chamberlain's party that the *Express* defends. The only "denigration" of Remembrance Sunday is by our ruling oligarchy who are quite happy to sacrifice youth in wars across the globe, only to denigrate the Cause of Freedom for which they fought when that Freedom is deemed contrary to the Establishment's squalid commercial and political interests.

NICE CHAPS NEVER DO

Late night T.V. pundits, chewing over the results of the U.S. elections as they came in on election night, spoke about the causes of McGovern's crushing defeat.

All were agreed (and embarrassed) that Race played a very big part in this debacle.

Louis Heron of the Times described the racial issue as the hidden factor, the time bomb, in the elections. He said that White workers did not want Black children bussed into white schools, "because they did not want their children's education to suffer . . ." For that reason many of them had voted for Nixon . . .

In commenting as to why so electorally an important issue as race should be a hidden factor, Heron said, "Of course, these days we are all nice chaps who never mention race . . ."

FORGOTTEN FRIENDS

At the beginning of November, I attended a protest rally by about 500 Central and East European exile anti-Soviet patriots.

They were fearful of the results of the forthcoming 1973 European Security Conference. They believe that it will be another and more drastic sell out by the Western powers.

It is postulated that the conference will result in the acceptance, in perpetuity, of all existing state frontiers in Europe. This would mean that legal sanction would be given to the Soviet Occupation Regimes in Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, the Ukraine, Georgia, etc., and to the Soviet seizure of territory from Germany, Romania, Finland and others.

The protest rally was given no press coverage whatsoever in the U.K. The Establishment is busy fostering good relations with the Soviet bloc, so that Capitalist banks and big multinationals can invest in these countries to take advantage of cheap labour and raw materials. It would therefore be surprising if the Mass Media gave useful publicity to anyone who was 'bad for business' in a big way.

It was the same motive that has led Nixon to court Peking and to cast aside Nationalist Chinese friendship.

I recall Lenin claiming that when the Communists prepared to hang the Capitalists, all the Capitalists would put up bids to supply the rope . . . HOW RIGHT HE WAS!

POLES APART

When, during question time in the House of Commons, on February 14th 1947, Communist M.P. Willie Gallacher was asked whether he knew that large numbers of Polish workers were seeking employment in this country, he replied, "Let them get employment in their own country." The leader of the Communist Party, Harry Pollitt wrote in his book *Looking Ahead* in 1947:

"I ask you, does it make sense that we allow 500,000 of our best young people to put their names down for emigration abroad, when at the same time we employ Poles who ought to be back in their own country, and bring to work in Britain displaced persons who ought also to be sent back to their own countries? We want our own workers to have confidence in their own land, to take pride in building it up."

Should anyone stand up in public today and use the self-same words as these top Communists used 25 years ago — but inserting "Coloured Immigrants" for "Poles" and "Uganda Asian refugees" for "displaced persons", it is 100% certain that the Communists themselves would be the very first people to leap up screaming "fascist!" "Nazi!" "Racial Discrimination", etc. etc.,

BRITONS have good cause to fear the consistent stupidity of British politicians and civil servants. In Northern Ireland a vicious war is raging designed to take away a province of the United Kingdom, and with it a million loyal citizens. Northern Ireland is an integral part of the United Kingdom, just as much as Pontypridd, or Kings Lynn, or Durham, yet the so-called 'British' government is obviously set on a path which can only end with the destruction of that province of the United Kingdom, and the destruction of the security of the lives of the one million British citizens who live in the province.

There seems to be more concern shown by British ministers for the 'plight' of Ugandan Asians than is shown for the murder of more than six hundred people in Northern Ireland – hardly more than a handful of people throughout the rest of the country seem sufficiently concerned about this to demand that the appeasement of murder and double-dealing should cease. I write as a Briton whose despair has, during the past four years, sunk to depths which I would not have believed possible when I first visited Northern Ireland in 1962. It is almost beyond belief that a part of my country is being totally and systematically destroyed by the agents of a so-called 'friendly' neighbouring country and yet neither the British government nor a majority of the British people is prepared to deal with the terrorists once and for all.

If the present wave of violence and terrorism, which the people of Northern Ireland have endured now for more than four years (they have suffered far more than anyone in any part of the United Kingdom suffered during any part of the second world war), if that violence and terrorism had broken out in Birmingham or Wolverhampton, instead of Northern Ireland, there can be no doubt that the people of Great Britain would have demanded that the armed rebellion should be crushed by whatever means were quickest and most certain; there would have been an irresistible demand for the return of the death penalty, including execution for the carrying of unlicensed guns or explosives, and any British government which dared to attempt to resist such demands would have been swept from office by a surge of public revulsion.

Within the space of six months the terrorists would have been crushed, with the full support of the British people for whatever measures were necessary.

But it seems that the people of Great Britain do not see the struggle in Northern Ireland as an attack upon their own country; for if they did see it as a direct attack they would surely not continue to allow the running dogs of the IRA, in the SDLP and the Northern Ireland Civil Rights Movement, to hold the government and people of this country to ransom – to the tune of almost sixty million pounds and more than six hundred innocent people murdered – nor would they continue to allow the citizens of the Republic of Ireland, which does nothing to prevent the activities of the 'gunmen' (who are regarded as national heroes), to come into this country to earn the money to pay for the bombs and guns.

Perhaps the people of Great Britain do care about the murder of innocent citizens, and the destruction of their lives and property. Perhaps people care but politicians do not; just as people care about the Common Market, but politicians do not, just as people care about immigration, but politicians do not, and just as people care about the housing situation, but politicians do not. It is well past time that the people of this country were told the truth about what has happened in Northern Ireland, and what will happen if this present so-called British government is not checked.

I.R.A. IN A NEW GUISE

In August 1968 the Northern Ireland Civil Rights Movement began a campaign of public demonstrations against what was claimed to be 'discrimination' in jobs, housing and local govern-

THOMAS BENFORD

THE UNSEEN SELL-OUT

ment. The Wilson government believed these claims, despite being warned that the so-called Civil Rights Movement was simply a cover for the same men of the IRA who had been responsible for deaths and bombings seven years before. These warnings were not simply ignored, they were silenced under the threat of a political deal with Dublin. British people were threatened by their own government when they dared to ask for protection against murderers!

But the civil righters, speaking the words put into their mouths by the IRA, were not interested in the truth, nor were they interested in either right or justice. The only interest of that movement was to spread the big lie of discrimination against the Catholics of Northern Ireland. To spread the lie that Catholics were in all the worst houses (you can judge the truth of that from the newsreels of the Ballymurphy and Creggan estates, which are as good as anything to be found in the New Towns of England). To spread the lie that Catholics were not allowed to work (when any fool knows that a man with nine children can live very well on social security, particularly if it gives him time to make petrol bombs and practise his marksmanship against British soldiers). To spread the lie that Catholics were not allowed to vote (even though every British politician knows that the reverse is true, that the foreign citizens of the Republic of Ireland are allowed to vote in British parliamentary elections). It was even suggested that the Catholic population were not allowed to receive as good an education.

LOYALISTS DESERTED AND ABUSED

All these lies were fed to the British people while the government of Northern Ireland, under the almost criminally stupid Captain Terence O'Neill, did nothing; the lies were allowed to spread unchecked and the loyal majority in Northern Ireland were deserted by their own political leaders, and abused by the very British government which should have defended them. It is little wonder that they were deserted by the Wilson government – the Labour Party had not set foot in Northern Ireland in the entire fifty years of the existence of the Province, and Mr. Wilson had a large Catholic population in his Huyton constituency.

No efforts were made to deal with the lies which the IRA put into the mouths of the civil rights movement. No campaign was opened to show off the marvellous hospitals in Northern Ireland, the finest hospital system in the United Kingdom and possibly in Europe, and open and free to every man, woman and child in the length and breadth of the Province whether they were Catholic or Protestant. No government spokesman was sent to England to tell of the tremendous scope of the Northern Ireland housing programme, which would be the envy of any city in England – if it were known about.

The Northern Ireland Minister of Education did not point out that the Catholic population of Northern Ireland refused to use the excellent state schools, but instead insisted on sending their children only to Catholic church schools – where

they were and are taught to hate the British nation. It did not even occur to that Minister of Education to point out that, in 1967 alone, twenty-six million pounds of British taxpayers money had been given to the Catholic church to build, equip and staff those schools. That kind of money, and more, is still being given for the building of Catholic schools, so that the Catholic population of Northern Ireland is able to support the terrorists who are destroying their schools, get the money to rebuild from the British taxpayer, and continue to tell the world that the British people are oppressing Catholics in Northern Ireland. Very clever, and typical of more than four years of lies from the same people.

But I must be honest. It is true that there is widespread unemployment in Northern Ireland, and that many Catholics are unemployed. But there are also many Protestants who are unemployed, and it is a fact that all without exception, whether Catholic or Protestant, receive exactly the same social security and welfare benefits as any other unemployed person in the United Kingdom, and families receive the full support of the welfare state. We are told by the Attorney General, Sir Peter Rawlinson, although I doubt if he knows very much about either unemployment or low wages or even working people in general, we are told that the people of Britain are not prepared to allow strikers to obtain social security benefits, and that the government intends to stop this 'abuse'. Yet not one member of the government has said a word about the way in which family allowances, unemployment benefit, Family Income Supplement and supplementary benefits are all being used by large Catholic families in Northern Ireland to subsidise the murder of more than six hundred people in four years and the destruction of nearly sixty million pounds worth of property and businesses. And these same people have refused to pay either rates, rents, electricity bills, or gas bills for almost a year now. Not only is the British taxpayer subsidising these supporters of murderers, he is doing so twice over. But not one word from Ministers – perhaps they are frightened of the IRA. Perhaps, and this seems more likely, these Ministers have been told by the Prime Minister that nothing must be done to upset Mr. Lynch, the Prime Minister of the Republic of Ireland, who has considerable political support from Catholic countries inside the Common Market.

UNEQUAL VOTING FOR EVERYBODY

It is also true that the local government elections in Northern Ireland were based on unequal voting (just the same as England and Wales before 1947); but it is equally true that the voting was unequal for everybody regardless of religion.

It is also true that there are people living in Northern Ireland who live in old houses without much room or modern services. But these people are both Catholic and Protestant. These houses are not kept for any one special group, anymore than poor housing in England is kept for one special group. It is equally true that the efforts of the Northern Ireland government and local authorities,

and especially of the Northern Ireland Housing Trust, have provided Northern Ireland with the finest record of house building of any part of the United Kingdom, and with the most modern and up to date housing to be found anywhere in the world. This housing is provided for Catholic and Protestant alike, without discrimination.

But the IRA was not satisfied with the successes of the lies mouthed by the civil rights and SDLP politicians. The IRA decided that the loyal people of Northern Ireland should be humiliated and terrorised and that their government should be destroyed. As a first step the IRA/civil rights demanded a ban on public parades and demonstrations. The government of Northern Ireland, threatened by Mr. Wilson, gave in to this demand. The IRA/civil rights then proceeded to hold public parades and demonstrations, now illegal, to show that they were the new masters in Northern Ireland. Every success has led to further demands from the terrorists and the Catholic population of Northern Ireland, until we have now reached the present stage where the only solution which the Catholics of Northern Ireland will accept is the total destruction of Northern Ireland as a part of the United Kingdom and the total subjection of the loyal majority under the guns of murderers.

Successive British governments have behaved, and continue to behave, as though they think that this is a good idea — which doesn't seem to say much for our chances in the Common Market.

First of all the Wilson government decided to destroy the Royal Ulster Constabulary — which had always defeated the IRA in the past. So Lord Hunt was sent to do the job. I suppose that Mr. Wilson thought that this was just the job for a man whose only claim to fame was that he had climbed a mountain.

Secondly, to make doubly certain that the people of Northern Ireland would know that they were being sold out, the government decided to send two 'old women' to Northern Ireland to 'fight' the IRA. The IRA and the Catholic population were delighted to see the arrival of Sir Arthur Young and General Freeland, and events were to prove that they were right to be delighted. The British government has never admitted that these tactics were wrong, still less has Mr. Wilson admitted that he was wrong. But they know that they were wrong, as clearly as I and the loyal population of Northern Ireland know that they were wrong. If you want the proof — where are Young and Freeland now?

Mr. Wilson, the British Prime Minister who thought that he could deal with the IRA by kissing their collective backside, keeps on talking about the

'discredited government' of Northern Ireland. The only recently discredited government that I know of is the government that was turned out of office on Thursday 18 June 1970 — Mr. Wilson's own Labour government.

Since that time the present Heath government has continued to appease the terrorists and sell out the law-abiding majority. While the smoke of terrorist bombs still hung over the streets Mr. Maudling could be heard mumbling about the need for a 'new political initiative' and 'the need to involve the minority in the government and get talks started'. Even in the face of direct threats from the SDLP running dogs of the IRA he refused to believe that the Catholics of Northern Ireland had only one aim — the total destruction of that part of the United Kingdom. Perhaps we can excuse him, we now know that he had a lot of personal worries on his mind. It is just a pity that he still felt able to take a fat salary as Home Secretary and continue the job of ruining the lives of a million of his fellow countrymen — who were having to pay him for the pleasure. And how they have paid.

But now the Heath government has decided to try something new. For more than four years the loyal people of Northern Ireland have gone in daily fear of sudden death, and nothing has been done. But now Mr. Whitelaw is in the province to betray these people who have suffered so much, and sell them out to the narrow, corrupt and priest-ridden society of the Republic of Ireland the so-called Free State. The only thing free about it is the hand-outs which its citizens receive from the British taxpayer, and continue to receive even when they also, and at the same time, support the murderers who rejoice at the deaths of British citizens, soldiers and civilians alike. From the moment he arrived in the Province Mr. Whitelaw has made it plain that his only object is to do a deal with the terrorists and their supporters, and that the loyal population of Northern Ireland will look to him in vain for protection. When the 'truce' was declared he spent a considerable amount of time in meetings with the IRA, yet at the same time when a group of ladies went to visit him, they were constituency workers for the Conservative and Unionist Party, he abused them, lost his temper, and terminated the interview. When the so-called truce was ended, by the IRA, he attempted to place the 'blame' on the loyal population. He has continued as he started. No demand of the IRA is too outrageous, and none of the pleas for help from the loyal population are listened to. Mr. Whitelaw seems determined to serve those forces which wish to destroy Northern Ireland, just as

Mr. Wilson was before him. Mr. Whitelaw is betraying his countrymen to the IRA, in just the same way that Pierre Laval betrayed his fellow Frenchmen to the Nazis.

Nothing will now placate the hatred and bitterness of the Catholic population of Northern Ireland; even their children rejoice when they stone British soldiers to death. Catholic children in Northern Ireland have always been taught to work and pray for the destruction of Northern Ireland, but now they are being encouraged in their desire to help their elder brothers and fathers who have guns in their hands. If these children survive for their natural span of life, and the welfare state of the Britain which they despise is designed to ensure that they do survive, then they have another sixty years of hatred and bitterness and murder before them, and their children will be brought up in the same narrow path of bitterness and hatred — and a hundred years will pass and still there will be no end to the bloodshed.

HYPOCRISY OF THE PRIESTS

No power on earth, and certainly not the power of God as expressed in the Irish Catholic Church, will placate these people; neither the Cardinal, nor his priests, nor his murderous flock or their lying politicians, have ever been known to demand an international public inquiry into the deaths of children killed in their prams when bombs are planted in crowded shopping streets. But they do not hesitate to proclaim the innocence of every murderer of British citizens. It is understandable, because the terrorists will get for these people, with the bomb and the gun, what they cannot get legally — the control of the loyal population of Northern Ireland.

For as long as these people remain, or are allowed to remain, within any part of the United Kingdom there will never be peace for the brave people of Northern Ireland. We now know that money set aside by the 'free state' government for 'the relief of suffering in the North' was in fact used for the purchase of arms. These weapons have been, and are being, used to kill and maim loyal citizens from every part of the United Kingdom. The government of the Republic of Ireland protests that 'we did not know', and makes sad public noises. But in his heart the southern Irishman, whether politician or labourer, rejoices because he knows that with a weak and cowardly British government (with no concern for the best interests of its own people — whether in Britain or in Europe) those arms will get him what he could not hope to aspire to, the destruction of a part of the United Kingdom.

There are only two possible alternative solutions for Northern Ireland, and only the people can decide; the British government has shown quite clearly that it will crawl for as long as the IRA wants it to crawl. Either we will do nothing, and sit back and watch a part of our country be destroyed and the people of that part of the country sold into the hands of those who hate them and wish to destroy them, or we shall see the example of Israel and destroy the republican threat once and for all. There are no other ways. Talks, political reconciliation, involving the minority in the government, destroying the police force, allowing the murderers of British soldiers and civilians to walk the streets with impunity, none of these things are alternatives to either the assertion or the abdication of national will. Either the republican and Catholic terrorists will destroy Northern Ireland as a part of the United Kingdom, or we, the united people of a United Kingdom, will destroy the republican and Catholic terrorists.

And we, who call ourselves Britons and live elsewhere in the United Kingdom, we must not hesitate to give the people of the Province of Northern Ireland every possible support; for it is our country which they are defending, against the efforts of the terrorists to destroy it and the attempts of the so-called 'British' government to undermine it.

THOUGHT FOR THE MONTH

I was teaching then at New York University, which was a pioneer in racial integration; indeed, as a big university in so cosmopolitan city as New York, with its large negro community, the issue never really arose. I soon found out that there was an unwritten rule providing that negro students should be marked about two grades higher than whites for a given level of work. If a newcomer on the faculty deviated in his innocence from this rule when he turned in his first mid-term grade sheets, discreet words to the wise were communicated to him by his older colleagues, so that no lasting damage would be done by an unsuitable end-of-term grade that would have gone into the student's permanent record. One literal-minded young instructor, who refused to take these prudent hints, found himself the physical focus of the Dean's office, the student's parents and uncle, a delegation from the National Association for the Advancement of Coloured People, and a suave representative of City Hall.

Naturally the liberals on the faculty — that is, most of the faculty — had no difficulty in justifying this rule to themselves, though they never did get around to recognising it in public. The Negro students, they could explain, had come from inferior, usually segregated schools; they did not have an educated family background; conditions at home were difficult; they had to work on the side; it was important not only for them but for their people, the city and the nation that they should not be discouraged; and so on.

James Burnham
SUICIDE OF THE WEST

The following speech by Congressman John G. Schmitz in the United States Congress on August 16, 1972, and the accompanying article written into the Congressional Record (here slightly abridged), throw revealing light on Soviet technology and the extent to which it has been created and bolstered by the United States ever since the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917.

Congressman Schmitz is the Presidential candidate of the American Party, the third party in the Presidential election in November.

Mr. Speaker, the most despicable practice I have encountered in my lifetime is that of the successive Republican and Democrat administrations in carrying on aid and trade with the Communist nations which supply the weapons to kill our men in Vietnam.

How any Member of this body, who supports such action, can go home and sleep with a clear conscience, is beyond my understanding. Many of them have sons, like mine, who some day will serve in our Armed Forces if they are not already doing so, and may well be a target for those weapons whose manufacture we make possible.

In Arlington Cemetery we keep a 24-hour watch over our honoured dead, who made the supreme sacrifice to defend our country and freedom against its foes. Their loved ones mourn them still, and will never forget them. Many of these dead would be alive today if we had not done so much to build up and sustain the economy of the Soviet and satellite nations for the last half-century.

But as long as the dollars roll in to fill the coffers of the "big money" men who in turn make many of the largest contributions to both Republican and Democrat presidential candidates, those who profit from aid and trade with the enemy could not care less about the cost in blood paid in places like Korea and Vietnam. Business and hypocrisy of the highest order must be carried on — as usual.

For 10 years, Antony C. Sutton, research fellow with the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace, has been researching Soviet technology. He has so far written two volumes on "Western Technology and Soviet Economic Development." Today he is presenting a summary of his findings to the platform committee of the Republican National Convention in Miami, Fla. This is his shattering conclusion:

"There is no such thing as Soviet technology. Almost all — perhaps 90 to 95 percent — came directly or indirectly from the United States and its allies. In effect, the United States and the NATO countries have built the Soviet Union — its industrial and its military capabilities. This massive construction job has taken 50 years, since the Revolution of 1917. It has been carried out through trade and the sale of plants, equipment and technical assistance."

The evidence he presents in support of

this conclusion is of the greatest importance to every American and especially to all who make policy here in Washington. It is imperative that every Member of this body read what he has to say — and act accordingly.

Mr. Sutton says that "this information has been blacked out by successive administrations." I intend to see that it is blacked out no longer. Simultaneously with placing it in the "Congressional Record" today, I have released it to the Associated Press and United Press International and to major newspapers throughout the country. For once, let us submerge our differences and unite on an issue on which every man of conscience and honour in this country ought to be able to agree. These facts must not be suppressed or ignored because of concern about face-saving or a desire to pretend that unpleasant truths do not exist. Those who fail to print and publicise Mr. Sutton's evidence do so at the peril of the lifeblood of America.

HAVE BUILT THE SOVIET UNION

Nor can it be hidden much longer in any case. This story will become too big to kill. You remember the old saying "murder will out". What Mr. Sutton reports is a very sophisticated kind of murder; the bodies involved are those of our own young men, crying out from the graves for justice. The truth about this murder through trade with the enemy is coming out and it will be heard.

The article follows:

The information that I am going to present to you tonight is known to the Administration. I am not a politician. I am not going to tell you what you want to hear. My job is to give you facts. Whether you like or dislike what I say doesn't concern me. I am here because I believe that the American public should have these facts.

I have spent ten years in research on Soviet technology. What it is — what it can do — and particularly where it came from. I have published 3 books and several articles summarising the work. It was privately financed. But the results have been available to the Government. On the other hand, I have had major difficulties with United States Government censorship. I have 15 minutes to tell you about this work. In a few words: there is no such thing as Soviet technology.

Almost all perhaps 90–95 percent — came directly or indirectly from the United States and its allies. In effect, the United States and the NATO countries have built the Soviet Union. Its industrial and its military capabilities. This massive construction job has taken 50 years. Since the Revolution in 1917. It has been carried out through trade and the sale of plants, equipment, and technical assistance. Listening to Administration spokesmen — or some newspaper pundits — you get the impression that

How America has built AID AND TRADE WITH THE SOVIET UNION IN PERSPECTIVE

trade with the Soviet Union is some new miracle cure for the world's problems. That's not quite accurate.

The idea that trade with the Soviets might bring peace goes back to 1917. The earliest proposal is dated December 1917 — just a few weeks after the start of the Bolshevik Revolution. It was implemented in 1920 while the Bolsheviks were still trying to consolidate their hold on Russia. The result was to guarantee that the Bolsheviks held power: they needed foreign supplies to survive. The history of our construction of the Soviet Union has been blacked out — much of the key information is still classified — along with the other mistakes of the Washington Bureaucracy. Why has the history been blacked out?

HAS NOT BROUGHT PEACE

Because 50 years of dealings with the Soviets has been an economic success for the USSR and a political failure for the United States. It has not stopped the war, it has not given us peace. The United States is spending \$80 billion a year on defence against an enemy built by the United States and Western Europe. Even stronger, the United States apparently wants to make sure this enemy remains in the business of being an enemy.

Now at this point, I've probably lost some of you. What I have said is contrary to everything you've heard from the intellectual elite, the Administration, and the business world, and numerous well regarded Senators — just about everyone. Let me bring you back to earth.

First an authentic statement. It is authentic because it was part of a conversation between Stalin and W. Averell Harriman. Ambassador Harriman has been prominent in Soviet trade since the 1930's and is an outspoken supporter of yet more trade. This is what Ambassador Harriman reported back to the State Department at the end of World War II: "Stalin paid tribute to the assistance rendered by the United States to Soviet industry before and during the War. Stalin said about two-thirds of all

TRADE WITH ET ENEMY PECTIVE

the large industrial enterprises in the Soviet Union has been built with the United States help or technical assistance."

I repeat: "two-thirds of all the large industrial enterprise in the Soviet Union has been built with the United States' help or technical assistance." Two-thirds. Two out of three. Stalin could have said that the other one-third of large industrial enterprises were built by firms from Germany, France, Britain, Italy, and so on. Stalin could have said also that the tank plants, the aircraft plants, the explosive and ammunition plants originated in the United States. That was June 1944. The massive technical assistance continues right down to the present day.

SOVIET INDUSTRY IN PERSPECTIVE

Now the ability of the Soviet Union to create any kind of military machine, to ship missiles to Cuba, to supply arms to North Vietnam, all this depends on its domestic industry. In the Soviet Union about three-quarters of the military budget goes on purchases from Soviet factories.

So let's take a look at the Soviet industry that provides the parts and the materials for Soviet armaments: the guns tanks, aircraft. The Soviets have the largest iron and steel plant in the world. It was built by McKee Corporation. It is a copy of the United States' steel plant in Gary, Indiana. All Soviet iron and steel technology comes from the United States and its allies. The Soviets use open hearths, American electric furnaces, American wide strip mills, Spitznagel mills, and so on — all developed in the West and shipped in a peaceful trade. The Soviets have the largest tube and pipe mill in Europe — 1 million tons a year. The equipment is Fretz-Moon, Salem, Aetna Standard, Mannesman, etc. Those are not Russian names.

All Soviet tube and pipe-making technology comes from the United States and its allies. If you know anyone in the space business, ask them how many miles of tubes and pipes go into a missile. The Soviets have the largest merchant marine in the world — about 6,000 ships. I have the specifications for each ship. About two-thirds were built

outside the Soviet Union. About four fifths of the engines for these ships were also built outside the Soviet Union.

There are no ship engines of Soviet design. Those built **inside** the USSR, are built with foreign technical assistance. The Bryansk plant makes the largest marine diesels. In 1959 the Bryansk plant made a technical assistance agreement with Burmeister & Wain of Copenhagen, Denmark (a NATO ally), approved as peaceful trade by the State Department. The ships that carried Soviet missiles to Cuba ten years ago used these same Burmeister and Wain engines. The ships were in the POLTAVA class. Some have Danish engines made in Denmark and some have Danish engines made at Bryansk in the Soviet Union. About 100 Soviet ships are used on the Haiphong run to carry Soviet weapons and supplies for Hanoi's annual aggression. I was able to identify 84 of these ships. None of the main engines in these ships was designed and manufactured inside the USSR. All the larger and faster vessels on the Haiphong run were built outside the USSR. All shipbuilding technology in the USSR comes directly or indirectly from the United States or its NATO allies.

MOTOR INDUSTRY IN DETAIL

Let's take one industry in more detail: motor vehicles. All Soviet automobile, truck and engine technology comes from the West: chiefly the United States. In my books I have listed each Soviet plant, its equipment, and who supplied the equipment. The Soviet military has over 300,000 trucks — all from these United States built plants. Up to 1960, the largest motor vehicle plant in the USSR was at Gorki. Gorki produces many of the trucks American pilots see on the Ho Chi Minh trail. Gorki produces the Soviet jeep and half a dozen other military vehicles. And Gorki was built by the Ford Motor Company — as peaceful trade.

Also in 1968 we had the so-called "FIAT deal" — to build a plant at Volgograd three times bigger than Gorki. Dean Rusk and Walt Rostow told Congress and the American public this was peaceful trade — the FIAT plant could not produce military vehicles. Don't let's kid ourselves. Any automobile manufacturing plant can produce military vehicles. The term "FIAT deal" is misleading. FIAT in Italy doesn't make automobile manufacturing equipment — FIAT plants in Italy have United States equipment. FIAT **did** send 1,000 men to Russia for erection of the plant — but over half, perhaps well over half, of the equipment came from the United States. From Gleason, TRW of Cleveland, and New Britain Machine Co.

So in the middle of a war that has killed 46,000 Americans (so far) and countless Vietnamese with Soviet weapons and supplies, the Johnson Administration doubled Soviet auto output. And supplied false

information to Congress and the American public. Finally, we get to 1972 under President Nixon.

LARGEST PLANT IN THE WORLD

The Soviets are receiving now — today, equipment and technology for the largest heavy truck plant in the world: known as the Kama plant. It will produce 100,000 heavy ten-ton trucks per year — that's more than **ALL** United States manufacturers put together. This will also be the largest plant in the world. It will occupy 36 square miles. Will the Kama truck plant have military potential? The Soviets themselves have answered this one. The Kama truck will be 50 percent more productive than the ZIL-130 truck. Well, that's nice, because the ZIL-130 truck is a standard Soviet army truck. It's used in Vietnam and the Middle East. Who built the ZIL plant? It was built by the Arthur L. Brandt Company of Detroit, Michigan. Who's building the Kama truck plant? That's classified "secret" by the Washington policy makers. I don't have to tell you why.

The Soviet T-54 tank is in Vietnam. It is in use today in Vietnam. According to the tank handbooks, the T-54 has a Christie type suspension. Christie was an American inventor. Where did the Soviets get a Christie suspension? Did they steal it? No, sir! They bought it. They bought it from the United States Wheel Track Laver Corporation.

Of course, it takes a great deal of self-confidence to admit you are sending factories to produce weapons and supplies to a country providing weapons and supplies to kill Americans and Vietnamese.

Many people — as individuals — have protested our suicidal policies. What happens? Well, if you are in Congress — you probably get the strong arm put on you. The Congressman who inserted my research findings into the Congressional Record suddenly found himself with primary opposition. He won't be in Congress next year.

DEMONSTRABLY FALSE

If you are in the academic world — you soon find it's OK to protest United States assistance to the South Vietnamese, but never, never protest United States assistance to the Soviets. Forget about the Russian academics being persecuted — we mustn't say unkind things about the Soviets. If you press for an explanation, what do they tell you? First you get the Fullbright line. This is peaceful trade. The Soviets are powerful. They have their own technology. It's a way to build friendship. It's a way to a new world order. This is demonstrably false. The Soviet tanks in AnLoc are not refugees from the Pasadena Rose Bowl Parade. The "Soviet" ships that carry arms to Haiphong

Contd. on page 15

Here is the English text of a speech made by Enoch Powell in French at a press luncheon in Brussels on Thursday, 28 September, 1972.

It is now little more than three months until the Ninth Symphony of Beethoven is to crash out and signalise the entry of the United Kingdom into the E.E.C. You have in Louvain an avenue which is called the "Avenue of Joyous Entry". The political fact which I have to tell you — a political fact, surely, not much less important for Britain's continental neighbours than for herself — is that for the British people as a whole this "entry" is not "joyous". Much the reverse. The incontestable truth, which survives all the tests to which it is subjected, is that the majority of the British remain to this day adverse to their country being part of the Community. Even that greatest of all political persuaders, the fait accompli, the sense of inevitability and *rex judicate*, has not been able to shake their morose antipathy, which has been sustained throughout all procedures and which has proved impervious to the blandishments both of the media and of authority.

I do not propose to trouble you with the causes of this political fact: they are as profound as they are complex. My object is to acquaint you with the consequences, because these are a practical matter which will concern you as well as us.

In addressing you in this sense I am not falling foul of the wholesome rule that one does not discuss abroad political differences which exist at home. Those who support British membership wish the Community to be a political entity and believe that in some degree it is such already and that Britain ought to be ready to merge her political life with that of her Continental neighbours. Well, if so, the distinction between internal and external politics disappears: European politics are domestic, not foreign; and there is no shame or reproach in conducting in Brussels whatever debate one would conduct in Birmingham. For the opponents of British membership it is a matter of national honour and candour towards friends and allies to leave them under no misapprehension as to political facts as relevant to their affairs as to our own. Albion has so often been thought perfidious because nobody bothered to tell disagreeable truth about Britain and nobody bothered to listen. Forgive me if I suggest that the fault seems to me to be evenly balanced: in most of the countries of the Common Market neither the press nor the public will listen to anything about British membership except what they wish to believe or what their governments wish to be believed. I must say that if a country were applying to join the United Kingdom, and we heard that the majority of its inhabitants did not wish to do so, or perhaps even acquiesce in doing so, we should take much more notice (to put it mildly) than you here on the continent are taking of the corresponding situation for Britain and the

MARKET ENTRY: WHY BRITAIN WON'T PLAY

Community.

When I addressed audiences on this subject in the Common Market countries early last year, I told them that the British government did not possess the necessary authority to conduct the negotiations and to conclude a treaty, because they did not have the "full-hearted consent" of the British people to this fundamentally important step which the government itself and its chief had declared to be indispensable. Nothing has happened since to alter this. The necessary legislation was forced through parliament by majorities so exiguous as frequently to be derisory; and even this was only achieved by a ruthless exploitation of government influence and by procedures which are an affront to the constitutional conventions. So far from broad parliamentary agreement existing, there was not only bitter division within each party but one of the two great parties in the state stands committed either to renegotiate the treaty in fundamental respects or to abandon it. Her Majesty's Opposition, who, for the moment at any rate, enjoy more popular support than the government and who lost the last election only by the narrowest of margins, have taken the exceptional step of declaring that they do not accept the treaty or British accession as binding.

"THOSE PESKY ENGLISH"

These facts already ought to give pause to what is apparently the general if not universal assumption on the continent that, so far as the British are concerned, all is now finished and concluded and that those pesky English are "inside" for good and all, whether they like it or not. Those who so imagine know dangerously little. There is in Britain today a rising mood of cold anger, "not loud but deep", against decisions, policies and attitudes of government which ought to reflect the general will and command of public consent but manifestly do not. The cry, if cry there were, would be not "we are betrayed" but "we are despised". The British people, unlike other nations, have not — for constitutional reasons which may be good and proper — been given the opportunity to declare themselves for or against what every other nation concerned has treated as a fundamental act. That does not alter the fact that they have not assented to it.

I will now tell you what the con-

sequences will be. British membership of the Community will not stick. Lacking the essential foundation in opinion, it is built on sand. Every common policy, or attempted common policy, of the Community will encounter a political resentment in Britain which, quite apart from the merits of the case, will be stirred by the recollection of the circumstances of Britain's enforced entry. The discovery, (which will speedily be made) that parliamentary safeguards over taxation, legislation and individual rights have been surrendered not as a matter of academic abstract theory but in every day practice, will increase the determination to counter and frustrate the operation of the institutions of the Community. The continental nations have no direct experience of their own to tell them what the sovereignty of Parliament means to the British people; but the evidence of history should be sufficient to show the dangers of tampering with it. If Brussels, Luxembourg and Paris are imagining that the 'English gentlemen' will now 'play the game', they will be rudely undeceived.

These resentments will intertwine themselves with all the raw issues of British politics: inflation, unemployment, balance of payments, the regions, even immigration, even Northern Ireland; and every one of these issues will be sharpened to the discomfiture of the European party. We shall no doubt hear once more, at the so-called summit next month, that the British are amongst the keenest to promote economic, monetary, political unification. Nothing could be further from the truth. If these are, in any form, the objects of the present member countries of the Community, then the absence of Britain is essential for them even to be attempted, let alone attained. The course of British politics and the force of public sentiment will constrain any British government to oppose the transfer of political decision which is implicit in all the objectives of the Community. Mr. Heath was supremely right, two and a half years ago, to describe British membership as unthinkable without popular consent. That is as true today as it was then. It will be a tragedy for the relations of Britain with her continental friends if that truth has now to be demonstrated experimentally by 'testing to destruction' the undertakings and assurances which Her Majesty's Government have given without the moral and political authority to do so.

I cannot, of course, predict the political events in Britain of the next three years or

Contd. on next page

HEAR IVOR BENSON SPEAK

Readers of *Spearhead* should not miss the opportunity this month to hear one of the world's foremost writers and commentators on political affairs, Ivor Benson, who will be speaking in London on December 11th.

The meeting at which Mr. Benson will speak is at **Conway Hall (small hall), Red Lion Square, London W.C.1** and will begin at 7.30 p.m. It is being held by Albion Press, the publishers of *Spearhead*.

Ivor Benson is a South African, currently living in Durban, where he publishes his excellent monthly newsletter *Behind the News*, many articles from which we have reprinted. He has also lived and worked in Rhodesia and the United Kingdom, having had two spells in Fleet Street.

He has given lecture series over South African radio exposing Communism and for a time in the 1960s was engaged by the Rhodesian Government as Information Adviser. He is well known as the author of *The Opinion Makers*, one of the most brilliant exposures of the gutter press and mass media and written by one who has seen these institutions from the inside.

Mr. Benson is at present on a lecture tour of the world, incorporating Australia and Britain, and the British part of his itinerary is sponsored by the British League of Rights.

Mr. Benson's talk promises to be one of great interest to all serious students of world affairs. Afterwards he will, as is normal, answer questions.

Conway Hall will be well known as a location to many of our readers, but for those who have not been there before it can be easily reached by five minutes walk from Holborn underground station.

WHY BRITAIN WON'T PLAY

Contd. from previous page

even the next three months; that sort of prediction is the business of journalists, not politicians. The business of politicians is not only with the events of the moment, as they actually arise, but with the character and situation of nations and the behaviour of peoples. It is only fair, and it is in the common interest, that the politicians of the Common Market countries should not refuse to listen when their British colleagues try to tell them about what, after all, it is their calling to understand — the politics and the people of Britain. In this matter there are no exclusive sources of information or of insight — least of all, the official ones!

TWO GOVERNMENT ACTS REVIEWED

This article was printed in the quarterly Social Credit magazine ABUNDANCE. We reprint it with acknowledgements, not because we support every single word, but because we consider it a useful contribution to discussion of Britain's current problems.

This year has seen two Acts of Parliament each of which led to open confrontation with the Government by two large sections of the public. So bitter was the reaction of the people affected that there were resolutions either not to implement or to defy the law. Certainly not in this generation has there been such a cleavage between Government and people, showing itself in workers' violence in the one case, and the abrogation of local council rights in the other. Reference is made to the Industrial Relations Act and the Housing Finance Act. In the last analysis each affects money — people's incomes — and Social Credit is the only remedy.

The Industrial Relations Act, among many others things, controls strike action by trades unions. Workers consider that strike action is necessary, indeed their only effective weapon, when they feel they are not getting the wages they need to maintain their standard of living. Consequently that part of the Act will always be a bone of contention between the unions and the Government while this is the case. But should strikes be necessary to meet wage demands? Let us examine the circumstances of a strike and a 'go-slow' in the first half of this year.

Firstly, the miners struck when the National Coal Board said that to meet their full claim would cost £31m. more than they could afford. In their previous financial year, ended March 31st, 1971, the Board had paid interest charges of £32m. on their borrowed capital. This had reduced their actual operating profit of £5½m. to a published deficit of £26½m. Secondly the railwaymen staged a second 'go-slow' when the Railways Board would only pay the agreed pay rise from June 5th and not from May 1st. The amount involved was £4m. In their previous financial year ended December 31st, 1971, the Board had paid interest charges of £45.6m. on their borrowed capital. This had reduced their actual operating profit of £3.2m. to a published deficit of £42.4m. The interest charges cause the refusal of the wages claims — refusals cause strikes — strikes cause trouble with the Industrial Relations Act.

The Housing Finance Act calls for an increase in all council-house rents of £1 each from October 1st. Some local councils have

refused to implement the Act — in such cases a Housing Commissioner from Whitehall overrides the council. Some tenants' associations have resolved on a rent strike in respect of the increase. The whole body of council-house tenants (there are some 6 million council houses) is up in arms against the Government about this Act.

Figures obtained from the City Treasurer of a large municipal corporation show that for a new council house costing £5,500 the 'economic' rent was £10.67 per week. Of this £3.54 was for buying the land, building the house, maintenance, management, and rates, and the balance of £7.13 was for paying the interest charge on the loan raised to build the houses. Without the interest charge, the Government subsidy could have been withdrawn (a substantial saving to the taxpayer), and the tenant's rent still reduced by £1 per week. The Housing Finance Act could then have been operated without protest.

Interest charges are the key to the acceptance of the otherwise unacceptable Industrial Relations and Housing Finance Acts. Without them the bitter dispute between the Government and millions of the people of Great Britain need not arise. And why are they there? Nationalised industries and nationally owned houses are involved, and surely it should be Government capital that finances them, interest free. It should be, but it is not; it is 'borrowed'. But private individuals, pension and T.U.C. funds, savings banks, etc. entitled to interest charges on money they invest, cannot possibly supply the huge sums required out of their savings. In any event, no Government has ever floated a loan to obtain the capital for nationalised industries or council houses.

Social Credit alone has the answer and the remedy. The commercial banks actually create (make, bring into existence) the money by which the majority of the country's business is done. Year by year they expand the credit balances in their ledgers when they make overdrafts, loans, and advances, on which they charge interest. They supply to the Government the loans (created in the same way) for the nationalised industries and council houses, and they collect the interest on the loans. The remedy must be for the Government to take over from the banks the prerogative of the monetisation of the nation's credit. As simple as that.

G.H.M.

Read *Abundance*. Quarterly 10p post free. Obtainable from: S.C.C.C., Montagu Chambers, Mexboro., Yorks.

PICTURE WITHIN THE PICTURE

NONE DARE CALL IT CONSPIRACY by Gary Allen (available from Nationalist Books, 50 Pawns Road, Croydon CRO 2QF) 40p

Books on the International Communist Conspiracy proliferate today throughout the English-speaking world, and when reviewing each new one one tends more and more to use as one's criterion of quality how much useful information and ideas it offers that have not been provided by previous books on the same theme. This is particularly the case with books written and produced in America and approaching their subject from an American point of view, for these are many.

One of the chief merits of *None Dare Call It Conspiracy* that strikes the reader early on is that it attempts to approach its subject in language that is better adapted to the mind of the uninitiated than many of its predecessors. In rather folksy-wolksy language, the author, a leading spokesman of the John Birch Society, introduces his theme by using the analogy of the child's picture book in which there is one picture that appears evident to the eye on first sight but concealed within it is another picture much more meaningful which can only be seen on closer examination. World events, the author says, are today very similar. There is the simple and immediately recognisable picture presented by the mass media, but within it there is a much more profound picture, which is the true one and which can only be identified by more careful study and intelligence.

None Dare Call It Conspiracy is intended to present the latter picture.

The book, having, we hope, got its reader onto the right wavelength, then goes on to produce a wealth of facts which establish how moneyed interests in America and the Western World have striven to promote Communism. Many of these facts will not be new to the student of such matters, but some perhaps will. The role of certain New York banking interests in building up the Soviet State will be known to many. Perhaps less known are the roles of the Rockefeller and J. P. Morgan empires in the same process. Very strong evidence is produced to support the statement, made before now in this journal, that the Soviet economy would still be one of the more primitive ones in the world were it not for Western financial aid and Western technology.

Much attention is focussed on the Council for Foreign Relations (CFR), a body patronised by the 'super-rich' in America, which has a record second to none in helping Communism and promoting world government. The CFR is reckoned by the author, as by many other respected commen-

tators, to be more powerful than the Government of the United States — and in fact the real Government of the United States.

For the benefit of British readers, CFR's equivalent here is the Royal Institute of International Affairs (Chatham House) a body with an equally intensive record of promoting internationalism and eroding national sovereignty. The fact that CFR is so little known to the American public — certainly so far as its importance is concerned — is, implies the author, an indication of how the real picture is concealed within the overt picture, as in the child's book.

One of the most valuable contributions that the book makes towards an understanding of the 20th Century lies in its exposure of the role of internationalist and banker forces in bringing about World War I, and in particular in manoeuvring American entry. Since official history has made so much of the nationalistic factors involved in this holocaust (as a means, of course, of discrediting nationalism and patriotism), this role is well worth studying. Mr. Allen gives particular prominence to the use of the Lusitania sinking as part of a conspiracy to drag the U.S. into the war in violation of all President Wilson's electoral promises of neutrality. Interestingly enough, America's presidents in both World Wars share this fact in common that they involved their country in hostilities after making such pledges to the electorate. Roosevelt did so a quarter of a century later, as the author points out.

The last part of the book brings us right up to date by examining the real political record of President (recently elected for a second term) Nixon. Nixon, as confirmed in his recent campaign, goes to the polls speaking the language of the right-wing strong man that most Americans seek. But when in power his policies are well to the left. Mr. Allen analyses these policies in detail, and gives abundant evidence to show that Nixon is in fact the tool of the CFR

internationalist, pro-communist power structure that governs America.

What of the weaknesses of the book? The greatest that one can see is that it is written largely from an old-fashioned liberal (as distinct from modern day leftist-liberal) standpoint. There is an American populist tradition going back to the early independence days which holds that "the least government is the best government" both with respect to economic and political affairs. The unreality of this theme in the light of modern problems seems to have impressed itself least on the Anglo-Saxon world. Because contemporary state power is now in the wrong hands, the rather facile inference is drawn that all state power is bad. In fact strong state power in some form is the only possible antidote to the unbridled pursuit of self-interest by the numerous big business groups that the author so ably describes.

It is tempting sometimes to use a falsehood that no longer may seem to matter in order to better illustrate a truth that very much matters. This is done by the author when he lists Hitler among the various people who set out to conquer and unite the whole world. In point of fact, it was this absurd allegation, inflated into the biggest lie of the Twentieth Century, that enabled the International Communist conspirators to engineer the Second World War. That Hitler and his system were firm opponents of the International Communist conspiracy is a fact that is not altered by the abhorrence of the civilised world at his methods. It is not to approve of these methods to recognise that behind them lay the intention of Germany merely to make herself independent of the international financial power structure and powerful enough to resist it and its Soviet creation. If such an aim stands damned because it ended in atrocity, it could equally be said that Dresden and Hiroshima were atrocities. Mr. Allen's purpose surely is to assist a real understanding of the history of this century, and that he does admirably throughout most of the book. Since World War II occupies a place of such enormous importance in that history, however, it is better that its cause is shown in the full light of day.

John Clifton to Fight Uxbridge



JOHN CLIFTON

The highest percentage of the poll so far achieved by a National Front candidate in a London local authority by-election was achieved by Mr. John Clifton, S.W. London Area Organiser (on left), when he won 16 per cent in the election for the Nightingale Ward of Wandsworth Bor-

ough.

Voting figures were as follows: Conservative 1,364; Labour 1,160; NF 446.

Following his impressive showing in Wandsworth, Mr. Clifton has now been nominated as National Front candidate in the parliamentary by-election on December 7th at Uxbridge. The NF has planned an intensive campaign of activity leading up to this by-election, and all activists in the Greater London and Home Counties area are asked to help. Those willing to do so should contact NF H.Q., 50 Pawns Road, Croydon CRO 2QF. (Tel. 01-684 3730).

AID AND TRADE WITH SOVIETS

Contd. from page 11

are not peaceful. They have weapons on board, not flower children or Russian tourists. Second, if you don't buy that line you are told, "The Soviets are mellowing." This is equally false.

The Russian Communist Party is not mellowing. The only mellowing is when a Harriman and a Rockefeller get together with the bosses in the Kremlin. That's good for business, but it's not much help if you are a G.I. at the other end of a Soviet rocket in Vietnam. I've learned something about our military assistance to the Soviets. It's just not enough to have the facts — these are ignored by the policy makers. It's just not enough to make a common sense case — the answers you get defy reason.

Only one institution has been clear-sighted on this question. From the early 1920's to the present day, only one institution has spoken out. That is the AFL-CIO. From Samuel Gompers in 1920 down to George Meaney today, the major unions have consistently protested the trade policies that built the Soviet Union. Because union members in the United States have died in Korea and Vietnam. The unions know — and apparently care. No one else cares. Not Washington. Not big business. Not the Republican Party. And 100,000 Americans have been killed in Korea and Vietnam — by our own technology.

PROFESSIONAL SMOKESCREEN CONTINUES

The only response from Washington and the Nixon Administration is the effort to hush up the scandal. These are things not to be talked about. And the professional smokescreen about peaceful trade continues. The plain fact — if you want it — is that irresponsible policies have built up an enemy and maintain that enemy in the business of totalitarian rule and world conquest. And the tragedy is that intelligent people have bought the political double-talk about world peace, a new world order and mellowing Soviets. I suggest that the man in the street, the average taxpayer-voter thinks more or less as I do. You do not subsidise an enemy.

And when this story gets out and about in the United States, it's going to translate into a shift of votes. I haven't met one man in the street so far (from New York to California) who goes along with a policy of subsidising the killing of his fellow Americans. People are usually stunned and disgusted. It requires a peculiar kind of intellectual myopia to ship supplies and technology to the Soviets when they are instrumental in killing fellow citizens.

What about the argument that trade will lead to peace? Well, we've had United States-Soviet trade for 52 years. The 1st and 2nd Five-Year Plans were built by American

companies. To continue a policy that is a total failure, is to gamble with the lives of several million Americans and countless allies. You can't stoke up the Soviet military machine at one end and then complain that the other end came back and bit you. Unfortunately, the human price for our immoral policies is not paid by the policy makers in Washington. The human price is paid by the farmers, the students, and working and middle classes of America. The citizen who pays the piper is not calling the tune — he doesn't even know the name of the tune.

CONCLUSIONS SUMMARISED

Let me summarise my conclusions:

One: trade with the USSR was started over 50 years ago under President Woodrow Wilson with the declared intention of mellowing the Bolsheviks. The policy has been a total and costly failure. It has proven to be impractical — this is what I would expect from an immoral policy. Two: we have built ourselves an enemy. We keep that self-declared enemy in business. This information has been blacked out by successive Administrations. Misleading and untruthful statements have been made by the Executive Branch to Congress and the American people. Three: our policy of subsidising self-declared enemies is neither rational nor moral. I have drawn attention to the intellectual myopia of the group that influences and draws up foreign policy. Four: the annual attacks in

Vietnam and the war in the Middle East were made possible only by Russian armaments and our past assistance to the Soviets. Five: this world-wide Soviet activity is consistent with Communist theory. Mikhail Suslov, the party's theoretician, recently stated that the current detente with the United States is temporary. The purpose of the detente, according to Suslov, is to give the Soviets sufficient strength for a renewed assault on the West. In other words, when you've finished building the Kama plant and the trucks come rolling off — watch out for another Vietnam. Six: internal Soviet repression continues. Seven: Soviet technical dependence is a powerful instrument for world peace if we want to use it.

So far, it's been used as an aid-to-dependent Soviets welfare programme. With about as much success as the domestic welfare programme. Why should they stop supplying Hanoi? The more they stoke up the war the more they get from the United States. One final thought.

Why has the war in Vietnam continued for four long years under this Administration? With 15,000 killed under the Nixon Administration?

We can stop the Soviets and their friends in Hanoi any time we want to. Without using a single gun or anything more dangerous than a piece of paper or a telephone call. We have Soviet technical dependence as an instrument of world peace. The most humane weapon that can be conceived. We have always had that option. We have never used it.

How To Obtain SPEARHEAD

Spearhead is available from our office to those who wish to ensure obtaining copies for themselves every month and to those who wish to obtain quantities for redistribution.

Those wishing for copies for themselves each month should take out a subscription by filling in the form below and sending it to us with a cheque or postal order for the amount applicable.

NAME

ADDRESS

IF OVERSEAS, SEALED OR UNSEALED

ENCLOSED SUBSCRIPTION OF

RATES (12 issues):

British Isles: £1.50p


British Commonwealth: £1.50p unsealed
£1.80p sealed

Foreign: £1.50p unsealed; U.S.A. \$4.50 unsealed
£2.30p sealed \$6.75 sealed

Discounts can be obtained
for bulk purchases as follows:—

20—49 copies: 30 per-cent
50—99 copies: 40 per-cent
100—249 copies: 50 per-cent
250 copies and over: 60 per-cent

All cheques or postal orders should be made out to *Spearhead* and sent to:
50 Pawsons Road, Croydon CRO 2QF, Surrey



SIR: As a student of the History of European Art, I should like to defend my article 'Art and Nationalism' from the attack made on it by Mr. A. Coniam. In fact, his claim to take exception to almost every line of my article, "including some academic historical points," does seem a little "arrogant and opinionated," the very things he accuses me of being.

It is certainly true that the Greeks took pattern-making very seriously, but with their customary sense of proportion they confined it to its rightful place, namely on their splendid pots and other artefacts. Indeed, "abstract art" is nothing new; men have been using it to decorate pottery and textiles for centuries. What is new is the momentous significance now claimed for it. The Greeks, on the other hand, believed that great art was something more than mere decoration. They believed — and the whole history of art demonstrates the same belief — that it was the means of expressing the highest feelings and noblest ideals, and communicating them to their fellows through beautiful, but above all, intelligible images. This modern art patently fails to do. Devoid of any content or meaning whatever, it expresses only nihilism and the negative — the natural reflection of a dying culture. I notice that Mr. Coniam skilfully avoids this point, the fundamental argument of my article.

At no point did I "attribute modern art to Communist painters." What I did was to point to significant parallels between modern art and Marxism, and to show that modern art is the product of a civilisation whose spiritual values are essentially Marxist. Russia, moreover, did **not** outlaw this kind of art at the very outset of the Revolution; it actually welcomed it as an embodiment of the new revolutionary kultur. It was later overthrown, **not** because the peasants were opposed to any "cultural developments" (!), but because Social Realism could more effectively function as a propaganda art.

In addition, the fact that a man of nationalist opinions like Wyndham Lewis was prominent in the modern "Vorticist" movement was a singular aberration (not altogether surprising in view of the artistic climate of his time) which in no way argues

in favour of Vorticism or any other modern 'ism'. Laughably, Mr. Coniam admits this himself in his next breath by saying that "a man's politics have no bearing on his artistic ability"! In a desperate bid to find allies, he also asserts quite wrongly that the Futurist painters (who glorified modern machinery and regarded the Italian heritage as a burden), were "very nationalistic and anti-liberal" — he is probably thinking of the poet Marinetti. They were not "abstract painters" either. Besides their movement lasted a mere six years, and compared with the profoundly influential movements of artistic decadence such as Cubism, it made no impact at all.

In conclusion, I strongly resent the writer calling my appreciation of Michelangelo or Wagner or Shakespeare into question, an impertinent and irrelevant thing to do, as I did not discuss the work of these monumental geniuses.

RICHARD VERRALL
Hampstead, London NW6

SIR: John Tyndall's article in the October *Spearhead* drawing attention to Britain's feeble performance in the Munich Olympics, contained a passing reference to the debilitated state of British youth in general which raises several points concerning the nation's health.

There are many factors contributing to the declining health standards of the British people (the advance of medical science, and its success in patching up human wreckage, tends to hide the alarming nature of this decline), some of which a regimented national system could fairly quickly put right. Of these factors, by far the most important is food.

The quality of the factory food most of us eat is appalling. So appalling in fact that it is no exaggeration to describe some foods as poisonous.

In particular one must draw attention to bread. This is a basic food, and therefore its quality, or lack of it, of considerable importance.

Adulteration of bread and flour is nothing new. As long ago as A.D. 532 John of Cappadocia made a fortune by selling half baked bread. But today the scale of adulteration is greater because of the widespread use of chemicals.

The modern method of making bread industrially leaves the loaf as a worthless article of nutrition.

It may look pure and attractive, but it has no value to the body. Add to bread, the harmful long term effects of the enormous quantities of white sugar we consume, the high incidence of animal fat in our daily diet, lack of a nourishing beverage — tea, coffee and modern beer contain nothing to recommend them, and much to damn them — besides of course, our chemically polluted factory milk, it is hardly surprising that as a nation we are under par.

(Should anyone doubt that we are in

fact under par, they have only to examine National Health figures, to see the extent of our morbidity.)

Whilst the main consideration in the production of the nation's food remains profit, this state of affairs is certain to deteriorate further.

Another factor actually working against the promotion of good health in our nation is the decline in breast feeding.

As a result of liberalism in connivance with capitalism trying to radically change the role of woman in society, from that of first and foremost a mother and housewife, into that of some kind of repulsive imitation of man, breast feeding has diminished and further declines.

(Rabid Feminists have also made their unholy contribution to this worrying decline.)

Now not only is it of vital importance both physically and psychologically for women to breast feed their young, but from the child's point of view it is a prerequisite for successful brain development and good health as an adult.

It is a fact that the brain development of breast fed children is far superior to children weaned on artificial feeds.

Unless breast feeding becomes common place in Britain in the fairly near future the price for this particular form of "progress" on the bodies and spirits of our people will be catastrophic.

I have only touched upon two aspects actively contributing to the general morbidity to be observed among our people at the present time — there are many more.

Only an overthrow of the false values of liberalism can bring about a climate in which these problems can be tackled with any likelihood of success.

BARRY BIDWELL
Stoke-sub-Hamdon, Somerset

SIR: It is heartening to see what a strong reaction has greeted the Government's despicable laws classifying White Commonwealth citizens as 'aliens' in this country. However, there should hardly be any surprise at what the Government does. As A. K. Chesterton has testified in *The New Unhappy Lords*, there has for many years been a deliberately organised conspiracy to break up the British world — of which the campaign to get Britain in the Common Market is only a part. This conspiracy could be seen in operation as long ago as the signing of G.A.T.T., (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade) which was framed to break up Britain's Imperial Preference system.

You can be quite sure that the classification of our British kith and kin as aliens was a calculated snub intended to continue this process.

R. S. BRYANT
Bridgewater, Somerset

Trouble shooting

The National Suppress

Why did not a single national newspaper report the National Front parade to the Cenotaph this year? The very fact that it was the biggest gathering of so-called "Right Wing extremists" seen in Britain for more than 20 years was a news story in itself.

One of our readers telephoned the newsdesk of *The Times* on the Monday after Remembrance Day to ask about the omission. A young reporter confided that he had a sympathy for the National Front, and that he knew that the paper had received 'copy' reporting the parade, but that the Editor had given strict instructions that it was not to be used.

The fact that this silence was maintained by all the national press and TV would indicate that the Editor of *The Times* was simply translating into an order a "suggestion" circulated to all media editors by the Establishment, which was desperate to suppress the fact that the Official ceremony was the poorest attended in the history of Cenotaph services, being supported by far fewer people than supported the National Front service. Were it not for the military formations at the Official ceremony, Whitehall would have been half empty.

This is very sad. Any occasion when our Queen appears for an official ceremony should be well supported by patriotic members of the public. The fact that they did not assemble in Whitehall for the Official ceremony in their usual numbers cannot be blamed on the weather. On that Sunday morning it was fine and dry in London (unlike the afternoon).

The reason for the poor turnout, I believe, was because the kind of people who would have attended have been utterly sickened by the conduct of the Establishment in recent months . . . and, let us not beat about the bush, upset by the compliance in this conduct of Her Majesty the Queen. Patriotic people were in no mood to assist Establishment figures enact an empty ritual performed by cynics.

On Remembrance Sunday we are supposed to remind ourselves of the supreme sacrifice of countless thousands of Britons who died that Britain might be free — free from invasion and foreign domination. Yet what had the high and mighty who laid the wreaths at the Official ceremony been up to in recent months? Encouraging and facilitating the flood of our land by countless thousands of Coloured aliens . . . spending hundreds of thousands of pounds on pampering the Coloured invaders whilst elderly ex-Servicemen and war widows are left in

poverty . . . providing jobs and homes for aliens whilst a million of our own men are unemployed and whilst thousands of our families exist in slums . . . dragging Britain into the European Common Market and handing our national independence over to international bankers and Brussels bureaucrats against the clear wish of the majority of our people . . . that's what the high and the mighty have been up to.

To these betrayals our Queen has been willing to lend her name. In particular, she was willing to give her seal of approval to the Common Market Act of Treason, an Act which subverts her Sovereignty — the Sovereignty which she holds in trust for the whole of the British people, the Sovereignty which she swore to defend and uphold at her Coronation, the Sovereignty which a million men in the First World War and 300,000 men in the Second World War died to defend!

The excuse that the Queen is "the pawn of the politicians, and has to do what she is told" is, I am afraid, wearing a bit thin, following her quite alarming speech at the banquet given at Windsor recently for the President of West Germany. On that occasion the Queen could merely have been polite and recited the usual non-political platitudes. Nothing could have obliged her to make the controversial and divisive speech on the Common Market (replete with World Government innuendo) which she did give, with every visible sign of pleasure and alacrity.

That speech has done immense harm to her and the institution of the Monarchy. I doubt if it was written by Edward Heath. If Her Majesty received any help at all that will have come from her husband, Prince Phillip, whose Bilderberg Group associations and internationalist proclivities are well known.

Perhaps the Queen and her advisers thought that by coming out in favour of the Common Market the institution of the Monarchy would be safeguarded. If so then Her Majesty is seriously deluded. The architects of the Common Market are a gang of money and power-mad cosmopolitans who regard nations with contempt and her function as an anachronistic bauble. They have not the slightest interest in the preservation of the British Crown.

The sole guarantee of the survival of the Crown is the sympathy of the British people, and the British people alone. Such sympathy can only be sustained if the Crown fulfils its part of the loyalty bargain. Loyalty is a two-way thing.

I have no doubt that if things continue along the present path the time will come, in

only a few years, when the Establishment will terminate the Official Remembrance Day ceremony, for the whole thing will have become utterly meaningless. At that time the alienation of the ordinary British people from the high and mighty of our land will be complete, and the Remembrance Day parades organised by the National Front will take on a significance that the press will find impossible to ignore.

"You're White — Get Out!"

Mrs. Edith Andrews has been licensee of an off-licence shop in Leicester for many years. Recently she re-applied to her brewery, Everards, for a six year renewal of her contract, as she had done successfully several times before.

Mr. Anthony Morse, Managing Director of Everards, wrote to Mrs. Andrews in October telling her his firm would not extend her contract. He stated that the district in which the shop was situated was increasingly being taken over by Asian Immigrants and that more of his company's products would be sold if an Asian took over the business — namely Mr. Dhansukhlal Pastakia of Bombay.

Shocked at this 'reward' for many years of faithful service, Mrs. Andrews turned to Alderman Marston, leader of the Labour majority in Leicester City Council, for help. She got none. Then she turned to Leicester Branch of the National Front. Immediately photostats of Mr. Morse's letter were circulated to the local press, radio and TV, and a massive public outcry broke out. A complaint to the Race Relations Board was rejected because, the Board stated, they did not believe racial discrimination was involved.

The Board's decision may have been influenced by the fact that the arch-multi-racialist Tom Boardman, Tory M.P. for Leicester South, sits on Everard's Board of Directors. As a result of a call by Leicester NF to boycott Everard's beer, which was supported by several working mens' clubs, the brewery, in a fit of pique, decided to auction off the disputed premises. The boycott campaign, however, will be extended.

**Pass on
SPEARHEAD
to your friends**

N.F. MARCH BREAKS

At least 1,500 patriots marched through London to the Cenotaph on Remembrance Day. (12th November) in order to pay homage to Britain and the Commonwealth's war dead. This was the biggest Nationalist parade ever seen in London since the last war, and was almost double the size of last year's National Front Remembrance Day parade.

Despite appalling weather, marchers came in coach and train parties from all over the United Kingdom — from Huddersfield, Bradford, Edinburgh, Belfast, Blackburn, Manchester, Wolverhampton, West Bromwich, Leicester, Norwich, Cardiff, Bristol, Dorchester, Bath, Eastbourne, Brighton, Chelmsford, Greater London and the Home Counties — poured into Victoria, central London, in order to form the great column.

The column was led by a professional London-Scottish pipe band. Behind the band was a sixty strong Colour Party composed of Union Jacks, the flags of England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland, and of Australia, New Zealand, Canada, South Africa and Rhodesia. Leading the Honour Party of Ex-Servicemen was National Front Bristol Branch member Wing Commander C. P. Lewis-Whittam (R.A.F. Retd.), who had accepted the invitation to lay the wreath at the Cenotaph ceremony.

Marching with Wing Commander Lewis-Whittam were Mr. John Tyndall, Chairman of the National Front, and Rev. Brian Green, a Baptist Minister and member of the Hounslow branch of the NF, who had agreed to conduct the religious service.

Behind the Wreath-Laying Party were rank upon rank of ex-Servicemen and women. Among the glittering medals which they wore were mementos of active service in all theatres of the First and Second World Wars, of campaigns in India, Korea, Malaya, Cyprus, Kenya and Aden. Marching proudly



MARCH COLUMN
NF ranks stretch right down Victoria Street

with this section of the parade were many war widows wearing their husbands' campaign medals.

Following the ex-Servicemen and women came the main body of the parade... family groups, toddlers in push chairs, Old Age Pensioners, students, trade unionists, workers from the professions and industry — in fact a complete cross section of the British public. Supplementing the turnout of National Front members were a group of British Campaign Against Immigration members, led by their Chairman, Mr. Jim Merrick (who joined the Colour Party) and a number of Rhodesian and South African students and workers living in London.

From Victoria the parade marched down Victoria Street round Parliament Square and in to Whitehall. In order to get the whole of the column around the Cenotaph, the parade had to march halfway up Whitehall before right wheeling and marching back almost to the entrance of Parliament Square again. Supporters of the Anglo-Rhodesia Society — who had participated in their own service — stayed behind in Whitehall in order to participate in the National Front ceremony. Whitehall was closed to all traffic by the Police.

A square of Union Jack and Common-

wealth flags formed round the Cenotaph, around which the main body of the parade formed up. Inside the perimeter of the flags was a row of buglers on the north side of the monument, the pipe band on the south side, and the ex-Servicemen and Women's section, headed by the Wreath-Laying Party, with their backs to the Home Office, facing the front of the monument.

LAST POST

The buglers sounded Last Post, which heralded the Two Minute Silence. The Silence was broken by the buglers sounding Reveille. Wing Commander Lewis-Whittam then stepped forward and laid the National Front wreath at the foot of the Cenotaph. The inscription on the wreath read: "In grateful memory of the Servicemen and Women of Britain and the Commonwealth who fought and died so that Britain might be free. Their sacrifice must not be in vain. National Front."

The wreath laid, a single piper played a three minute lament. The haunting sound of the music echoing about the great public buildings, the intense silence of the great crowd which was emphasised by the gentle



AT THE CEREMONY
The Rev. Brian Green reads prayer (left). Buglers sound last post (right).



ALL RECORDS

Number at Cenotaph Testimony to Tremendous Growth



THE MEETING
A shot from inside the hall

flapping of the wind-stirred flags combined to produce a most moving period of meditation.

Rev. Green continued the ceremony by conducting a brief and dignified religious ceremony. He read an extract from the New Testament, recited a prayer of his own composition, then the whole crowd joined him in saying The Lord's Prayer and then singing the hymn *O God Our Help In Ages Past*.

MEETING

The ceremony over, the column re-formed for the march to the large hall in Westminster where a rally organised by the Remembrance Day Association had been arranged. As the column left Whitehall it was joined by several hundred bystanders who had watched the ceremony, so the column was swelled to about 1,800 persons.

By this time the weather had become atrocious, but despite the torrential rain the column held together until the hall was reached. However, large numbers of people, particularly elderly folk and mothers with children or people who had long distances to travel were unable to stay for the meeting . . . which in a sense was fortunate as the hall could not seat more than 800 persons. Even so it was packed to capacity.

After such a successful parade, the audience was in a mood of high enthusiasm. A particularly warm burst of applause was accorded to the first speaker, Wing Commander Lewis-Whittam, who expressed scathing contempt for the betrayals of "Ted Wilson and Harold Heath". The next

speaker, Mr. J. Kingsley Reed, had previously spoken on a National Front platform (in Blackburn) as a member of the Lancashire Conservative Association. On this day he was introduced as not only a member of the National Front but as the newly elected Chairman of Blackburn Branch.

Mr. Denis Pirie came on to the platform as a speaker at a moment's notice to address the meeting in the stead of Dowager Lady Jane Birdwood, who was unable to attend due to ill health. Mr. Pirie spoke as Chairman of the newly-formed National Front

Students' Association. Mr. Pirie was followed by British Campaign Against Immigration Chairman Mr. Jim Merrick, who was given sustained congratulatory applause for his magnificent result achieved at the recent Parliamentary by-election at Rochdale.

The meeting Chairman, Mr. Martin Webster, made an appeal for funds by the usual 'Dutch Auction' method. Two donations of £50 gave the collection a flying start, and then the amounts called for went down in £5 units, so that by the time the last of the silver had been collected a total of £564 had been raised . . . the biggest sum ever contributed by NF members at a single meeting.

The speech given by NF Chairman Mr. John Tyndall was constantly punctuated not just by applause, but by frequent standing ovations. His concluding comments on the theme "Their sacrifice must not be in vain" evoked sustained cheering and applause which nearly blew the roof of the hall off.

Before closing the meeting the Chairman told the audience that it had participated in by far the biggest Nationalist parade and the biggest Nationalist rally seen in Britain in post-war years. The National Front, he said, was on its way. M.W.

NF
puts
Britain
First

The National Front is Britain's fastest-growing party which says: "Put Britain and the British people first!" It is the true voice of the British people. Its main policies have been proved by one opinion poll after another to represent the views of the great majority of the British people. Find out more about the National Front by completing this form and sending it to: *The Secretary, National Front, 50 Pawsons Road, Croydon CRO 2QF, Surrey. (Tel. 01-684 3730)*

Name

Address

.....

.....

The National Front needs money. It needs the funds to print leaflets, pamphlets and posters, to fight elections, to mount demonstrations, to organise the biggest patriotic movement in Britain.

So invest in your country's future. Send a donation to the National Front Fighting Fund today. It will be money well spent.

A TESTAMENT OF LOVE FOR BRITAIN

By KEVIN SINCLAIR, Hong Kong correspondent of the Daily Express

This article recently appeared in the DAILY EXPRESS. We print it here as an indication where Britain's true ties and interests lie.

MY mother has never been to Britain. But she still calls it home.

So do I, although the last Sinclair to have departed from Caithness for the Akatarawa Mountains of New Zealand left Scotland five generations ago.

Some of them have been back since. My grandfather visited Britain in 1914, on his way to Gallipoli.

Six of my uncles went there in troopships on their way to Greece and the Western Desert in the Second World War.

UNJUST

But for me, and for millions of British like me in New Zealand, Australia, Canada, Rhodesia, and South Africa, the latest immigration restrictions mean we are exiles from a land we regard as our own.

We are barred under the monstrous and unjust regulations which lump citizens of the old Commonwealth with aliens.

Not all aliens, of course, because Britain's new relatives in the Common Market are carefully excluded.

THEY are able to move into Britain without hindrance.

THEY, in future, will be welcomed at British ports and airports.

At best, some of us will be allowed grudgingly to enter Britain for short periods.

Britons, of course, will still be welcome in New Zealand and Australia.

Our flag still shares the Union Jack with the Southern Cross, emblem of the South Pacific.

We still stand in theatres for the National Anthem — God Save the Queen.

For us, you are swopping the non-British people of Europe.

On January 1, an Algerian on a French passport will have an unchallenged right to enter England and we will be excluded.

You will also throw the doors of London open to the peasants of Sicily, with their disquieting Mafia customs; to the Germans, whom we have helped you defy and defeat twice this century; to the French, and the Dutch and the Belgians and the other members of the New Order that is Europe.

Perhaps they, like we, cherish the Crown and the Houses of Parliament and

our common language.

But I doubt it.

The Home Office did not apply any immigration sanctions against the New Zealand soldiers who passed through Britain during two world wars.

RIGHT

We do not hold this against Britain as a debt. We hold that we acted because it was the right thing to do: and because we are all British people. When one of your new Common Market cousins plunged Europe into war 33 years ago, there were no questions asked about what New Zealand or Canada or Australia should do.

The New Zealand Prime Minister said: "Where Britain stands, we stand. Where Britain goes, we go."

The same conditions, we believe, apply today.

But now, I doubt that my mother will ever visit the country she calls home.

The Asians

We are the ridicule of nations
The way we're treating all the Asians.
Our Ted must be the only man
To want Great Britain Pakistan.
If his conscience pricks to serve them,
Then into No. 10 let's herd them.
They've got our houses, shops and schools;
There's not much left for us poor fools.
If we'd be those to hold the aces
Then let us up and paint our faces.
In other words let's all go barmy
And change into a Pakistani.

Mrs. Alison Hart

REMINDER

We are afraid we must again remind readers not to send money to *Spearhead* as part of cheques sent to other bodies, whether the National Front or Nationalist Books. These three bodies are for purposes of accounting entirely separate, and great confusion and slowing down in dealing with orders is caused by those sending money treating them as the same. All monies owing to *Spearhead* should be remitted to us by cheque or postal order addressed to *Spearhead* and to no other organisation.

read...

six principles of BRITISH NATIONALISM

by JOHN TYNDALL

15p (plus 3p postage)

from:— 50 Pawsons Road, Croydon CRO 2QF, Surrey

All patriots should read

CANDOUR

The British Views Letter

edited by

A.K. Chesterton

Published by Candour Publishing Co.
5 Elmhurst Court, St. Peters Road,
Croydon, Surrey.

"The New Unhappy Lords"

An exposure of power politics
By A. K. CHESTERTON

THE NEW UNHAPPY LORDS is a must for the bookshelf of any student of modern politics. It represents the most lucid and startling of all commentaries on the methods of subversion being used to undermine Britain and European Civilisation.

Cloth-Bound Edition £1.40p (28s.)
Paper-back Edition 60p (12s.)

(obtainable from Nationalist Books)

NATIONALIST BOOK CENTRE

50 Pawsons Road, Croydon CRO 2QF, Surrey

Send for our free catalogue now